

THE

802261

LETTERS

OF

A CITIZEN

ON

INDIA AFFAIRS.

L O N D O N:

Printed by GILBERT AND PLUMMER, CARE-CHURCH-  
LANE, LEADENHALL-STREET. 1783.

P R E F A C E  
A C T I O N

WHEN I wrote the following I expected I  
 had not the most distant idea of col-  
 lecting them together; but some of my friends  
 at the London Tavern and the Queen's  
 Arms, have assured me that they have been  
 favorably received, and have  
 therefore advised me to publish them. This  
 I do, in justice to the Proprietors,  
 whose sentiments on India Affairs, as contain-  
 ed in some of the letters, may perhaps afford  
 information to those who may have been  
 misled by the insinuations in the Ninth and  
 Tenth Reports.



---

---

## P R E F A C E.

**W**HEN I wrote the following Letters, I had not the most distant idea of collecting them together; but some of my friends at the London Tavern and the Queen's-Arms, have assured me that they have been favorably received by the public, and have therefore advised me to publish them.—This I do, in justice to my friend the Proprietor, whose sentiments on India Affairs, as contained in some of the letters, may perhaps afford information to those, who may have been misled by the insinuations in the Ninth and Tenth Reports.

A

I was



## P R E F A C E.

I was also induced to collect these letters together, from having seen the Ninth Report advertised for sale, and earnestly recommended to all captains of ships and others, who were desirous that their friends in India, should be thoroughly and authentically informed of the state of the Company's Affairs. I do think it the duty of every honest man, to detect and expose, as far as in his power, the falsties contained in that gross libel, which was printed some time ago as a pamphlet, and is still publickly sold under the title of "the Ninth Report of the Select Committee," and has been repeatedly advertised as containing an account of the Hon. Warren Hastings, Esq.

A CITIZEN.

Broad-Street,  
Sept. 10, 1783.



## LETTERS, &c.

### LETTER I.

MR. EDITOR,

I HAVE lately read two letters, addressed to Mr. Burke, by a Major John Scott, and I find, upon enquiry, that this person is the agent of Mr. Hastings; and that Mr. Hastings has hitherto baffled every attempt made by Parliament, by Ministers, and by the Court of Directors, to remove him from the government of Bengal. I must confess to you, Mr. Editor, that I looked up to Mr. Burke, for many years, as to a superior being. — His eloquence, his learning, his philanthropy, and his disinterestedness, were unquestionable with a great majority of the nation, as well as with myself. His conduct in office

last

last year, was not, however, quite upon a par with his former professions, and the eagerness with which he has pursued his own interest, and the interest of his relations, since the memorable and disgraceful coalition took place, has induced me to believe that Mr. Burke is at least as frail a mortal as myself.

I know nothing of Mr. Hastings, and I believed Mr. Burke was actuated by the purest motives, in opposing that gentleman. He represented him as the author of the Maratta war; the cause of the invasion of the Carnatic; and, of all the subsequent miseries and distresses, to which that unhappy country has so long been subject. I was present too, in the gallery of the House of Commons, when he so solemnly pledged himself to God, the House of Commons, and his country, to prove Mr. Hastings a most notorious delinquent; and when he said the world would be astonished at a Report he was soon to bring forwards. I was so much affected, Mr. Editor, with Mr. Burke's eloquent declamation, that I really wondered how any set of men could be so mad as to protect, for a moment, such a shocking character as this Mr. Hastings appeared

peared to be. I watched with impatience the publication of Mr. Burke's Report, I read it with attention, but without finding proof of Mr. Hastings' delinquency; though, to be sure, it did appear to me that he had carried the power of patronage to an unwarrantable extent, in one instance, as Mr. Burke stated it. The appendix I had not then an opportunity of seeing, as it was not published.

When this Mr. Scott's letters came out, I sent immediately to Sewell's for the pamphlet; I read them, and I must declare to you, Mr. Editor, if what Major Scott advances is founded in truth, he has most completely exculpated Mr. Hastings; but if he has misrepresented any circumstance, I hope he will be punished with the utmost severity of the law. One point I can vouch for, that his quotations from the Appendix, which I have lately read, are very exact; and I wish, Mr. Editor, the conduct of his Majesty's ministers would, at all times, bear so severe a scrutiny as the conduct of Mr. Hastings has done, particularly in the article of the expenditure of public money.

I really



I really conceived, Mr. Editor, that Mr. Hastings had sent Mr. Scott to England, with a view of securing him in the possession of the government of Bengal, by *management*, a word of extensive signification; but I find, upon enquiry, that Mr. Hastings has invariably pressed for a decision, without expressing much solicitude as to what it may be; and that Mr. Scott's sole object has been to defend the character of Mr. Hastings from the ungenerous attacks of men, who are eagerly waiting for appointments to the Supreme Council of India. I find too, upon enquiry, Mr. Editor, that such is the opinion Mr. Hastings's constituents have of his abilities, integrity, and honor, (and the Proprietors of India Stock are as independent men as any in this kingdom) that although the late ministers were against him; although the Rockingham party, (formerly his firmest friends) and thirteen Directors, including the Chairman and his Deputy, were against him, yet their united and strenuous endeavours, aided by Treasury letters, could only produce seventy-five votes, out of five hundred and four, for his dismissal; four hundred and twenty-eight voting for his continuance. A  
majority

majority so considerable in his favor, must necessarily have had great weight; and will, I dare say, induce every Member of the House of Commons to examine and judge for himself in future; and not, as I am afraid was the case last year, depend upon the judgment, the integrity, and the impartiality of Mr. Edmund Burke. Let me again observe to you, Mr. Editor, that if Major Scott has dared to misrepresent a single circumstance in his letters, he ought to be prosecuted with the utmost severity of the law; if he has not, what reparation can the author of the Ninth Report make, for wantonly traducing the character of an absent man?

*Broad-street,  
July 29, 1783.*

A CITIZEN.

## LETTER II

Mr. EDITOR,

**I** THANK you for your speedy insertion of my letter of the 29th ult.—and I feel so well pleased with being in print, for the first time these fifty years, that I may perhaps trouble you in future. I assure you, Mr. Editor, my attention has been very strongly drawn to the Ninth Report of the Select Committee.—Our Parliamentary orators have represented East Indians as little better than Devils upon earth, and I expected to find some proofs of the delinquency of the man Mr. Burke describes, as the first and most notorious of these plunderers: I mean Mr. Hastings. There is but one accusation against him in the Ninth Report, which appeared to bear hard upon him; and that is what I hinted at in my last letter,—giving a contract to the son of Mr. Sullivan, the late Chairman of the Court of Direc-



tors, upon improper terms.—To be sure, Mr. Editor, if this could have been proved, it would have sunk Mr. Hastings in the opinion of every honest man ; but, to my surprize and satisfaction, I find this transaction so fully explained, so completely justified from authentic records (unless the Appendix deceives me) that every honest man on our side Temple Bar, will pronounce Mr. Hastings exculpated from the charge of wasting the public money for private purposes.

I have a very great respect, Mr. Editor, for our most excellent Constitution.—But I do think it a misfortune, that it should be strictly constitutional for a Committee of the House of Commons to represent a man in high office, as a very base and unworthy character, and then to let the matter drop altogether ;—for in this Ninth Report it is observed, “ That the Committee do not bring charges, though their Reports may furnish matter for charges.” And further, “ That they are not obliged to report all they hear or know upon a subject.” —“ That it is at the discretion of the party accused, to reply, or not, hereafter.”—Why, what a

B

doctrine

doctrine is this, Mr. Editor? What honest man, in future, can sleep in peace in his bed, who has had any transactions with the public? He may be abused and scandalized, his character may be attacked, to answer a private purpose, as was really the case with Mr. Sullivan and Sir William James;—and, after all, a Secretary of State may get up in the House, and say, the determination of his innocence must be postponed to a future day; by these means leaving the malicious part of mankind to draw conclusions of the guilt of gentlemen who were ready and eager to prove their innocence. Now in the case of Mr. Hastings, to be sure, any man who reads the Ninth Report, will think him guilty: but let the same man read the Appendix, and Mr. Scott's letters, and he will pronounce, as I do, that Mr. Hastings has been basely, and scandalously treated.

I have seen, Mr. Editor, in several of your papers, and indeed in other papers too, an account of the appointment of one William Burke, Esq; to the office of Receiver of the Balances due from the Company to the Crown in India. You have been so accurate as to  
state

state the different orders that were issued from hence, and the periods at which they were issued. Still, however, this affair appeared to me so extraordinary, that I could not give credit to it. That a man, who like Mr. Edmund Burke, had talked for many years of the necessity of public oeconomy; who had even attacked the Civil List; who interfered in the domestic arrangements of our most gracious Sovereign, God bless him! who had brought in a bill to abolish sundry offices; by which very many worthy families are reduced to beggary and want: That such a man, Mr. Editor, should have created an useless office for his cousin, just to put three thousand pounds a year into his pocket, and to take so much from the state, was, to me, absolutely incredible! I spoke to a brother citizen yesterday, a very honest, worthy man, who is in the Direction. I asked him if it was true, that William Burke, Esq; was appointed Mr. Edmund Burke's Deputy in India; and if it was true that no such appointment did exist, in the time of that profuse Minister, Lord North, as Mr. Burke formerly described him? He told me, "It certainly is so; no such appointment did exist  
 " in



“ in Lord North’s time. I have examined  
 “ the Records of the Company, and I find  
 “ that *William Burke, Esq;* was appointed, by  
 “ the Lords of the Treasury, Deputy to  
 “ *Edmund Burke, Esq;* at the recommendation  
 “ of the said Edmund Burke, Esq; and that  
 “ this appointment was notified to us by  
 “ *Richard Burke, Esq;* a few days before the  
 “ death of the Marquis of Rockingham; and  
 “ I can further tell you, my friend, that the  
 “ appointment is worse than useless—it is  
 “ mischievous.”—Really, Mr. Editor, I can  
 find no instance like this, of a waste of public  
 money for private purposes, by Mr. Hastings,

*Broad-street,*

*Aug. 1, 1783.*

A CITIZEN,

## LETTER III.

Mr. EDITOR,

A Serious and attentive perusal of some late publications, excited my curiosity in a very great degree, to be fully informed of the conduct of our great men towards Mr. Hastings. Amongst us old fashioned folks in the city, he is a man, whose extraordinary and persevering character has attracted our particular attention. All people allow him to be a despiser of money. I never heard of him soliciting a Peerage, or even the title of a Baronet of Great-Britain from any Minister. He has neither family nor parliamentary interest, nor has his agent Mr. Scott, attempted to force himself into the Lower House, that he may meet Mr. Burke upon equal terms. Our city oracles say, that Mr. Hastings possesses very great abilities, with uncommon application to business; and my  
worthy

worthy friend the Director, tells me, that even his enemies in the India-House, allow him to be a sound politician, an able statesman, and a skilful financier. He added, even the croakers, who would persuade us all was lost, have held down their heads abashed and ashamed, since we received the accounts of our late successes, and the Marrata peace. I lately asked a friend of mine, who has four votes, and great interest in the Proprietary, what would have been the consequence had Mr. Hastings been recalled in 1782? We should have lost India, he replied; a new Governor could not have raised the supplies, and our negociations with the Marratas must have been suspended. As you wish to be acquainted with our politics in Leadenhall-street, I will give you a short history of them. When Lord North laid violent hands upon the Company, in 1773, Mr. Hastings was the Governor of Bengal; it was thought prudent to continue him, but two Gentlemen powerfully connected, were sent out in the Council, and upon the breaking out of the disputes in Bengal, Lord North and his friends determined to remove Mr. Hastings; they procured a majority of one vote amongst



amongst the Directors, several of whom enjoyed Government contracts, to second their views; but the Proprietors overset the attempts of the Ministry, and in this virtuous struggle, were even assisted by the Duke of Richmond, and all the good men of the Rockingham party, who used to say in those days, that the East-India Company ought not to be managed by John Robinson. You and I, my friend, have lived to see strange alterations. The two powerful men, General Clavering and Colonel Monson died; then it was that Lord North shewed a desire to support Mr. Hastings; and tho' he had taken much pains to remove him, in 1776, yet in 1780, and 1781, he was the very man who proposed him to be continued at the head of the Government. See, my friend, how matters are carried on in this silly country; for though Mr. Hastings had committed no crime, yet his former friends, the Rockinghams, deserted him the moment Lord North took him up! Thus matters went on till March, 1782. You remember with what advantages the Rockingham people then came in, and in how high a light many of us in the

the city held Edmund Burke, the panegyrist of that party. We were tired of the American war; we heard of nothing but defeats in all quarters. Many of our friends were so far imposed upon, and led away by the inflammatory speeches of Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke, that we believed Lord North to be the most extravagant, abandoned, and flagitious Minister that this country had ever been cursed with. To be sure in those days, we never thought these three men could kiss and be friends in less than a year; so ignorant we citizens are of high life!—We gave the new men credit for every thing they did, and every thing they said; even Lord Rodney's recall and Mr. Burke's attack upon him, did not excite the popular resentment; what then could the friends of Mr. Hastings expect? An absent man; no family or parliamentary interest; the salary of his office twenty-five thousand pounds a year; a prospect opening of further removals; for Mr. Hastings once disposed of, Mr. Hornby, Mr. Wheler, and Mr. Macpherson would soon have followed: The salaries of these Gentlemen amounting to sixty one thousand pounds a year, independent of the great power and patronage

patronage annexed to their offices. Think my friend, what a temptation to the many needy dependents of our great men, who were themselves, most of them, at least, in the greatest distress, and in debt to every one that would trust them! Such a prospect was, indeed, enough to allure almost every gambler at Brooks's, to the standard of the Minister. Two Committees sitting, the virtuous Edmund Burke, and the immaculate General Richard Smith, the leading members of one of them. Popular prejudices strong; what then had the Ministry to fear? Victory was secure; they had only to fix the mode of attack. To be sure there were some members of the cabinet, to their eternal honor be it spoken, who thought the long and faithful services of Mr. Hastings, his spirit, and decision during the war, his relief of the Carnatic, and his wonderful exertions in every part, deserved a better return than a disgraceful and ignominious removal; but they were borne down by the weight of the Rockingham party, and compelled to submit. The temerity and presumption of Mr. Hastings's enemies did, what his great merits would not otherwise have enabled him to do: it left him



to save India. The Ministers ordered the Directors to do, what the Proprietors in the end would not permit them to perform. If a Bill had been produced in May, 1782, Mr. Burke and his friends might have hurried it through in a month; but they had so completely silenced Lord North, who scarcely appeared, except in defence of Mr. Rigby, that they did not conceive any body of men would be hardy enough to dispute their pleasure, when it came forth in the form of a vote of the House of Commons. When this vote did pass, though the fate of India depended upon the wisdom of it, there were fewer Members present, as our Epsom friend tells me, than generally attend a common Turnpike Bill. Mr. Johnstone told them then, that the vote would be nugatory if the Company differed from the House in opinion, as to the merits of Mr. Hastings; but Mr. Fox, and Mr. Burke, in the height of their power and popularity, treated this wholesome hint with disregard. "Who dare dispute a vote of this House?" was the laconic reply, and the ministerial fiat was sent to the India House, where thirteen Directors, including the Chairs, were obedient to the mandate. But  
now

now was the time, my friend, for Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke to find, that they were not quite so powerful on this side Temple-bar as at Westminster: The independent Proprietors who owed Mr. Hastings protection and support, in return for long service, tried fidelity, and sound integrity, in difficult and tempting situations, were determined to judge for themselves. The result you know, and in your next letter ask Mr. Fox, Mr. Burke, and the thirteen Directors of their party, if they do not think the Proprietors performed good service to their country and the East-India Company, when they preserved Mr. Hastings in the government of Bengal.

These, Mr. Editor, are my neighbour's sentiments, and his words, as nearly as I can recollect them. You shall have my opinion in another letter.

Broad Street,

Aug. 4, 1783.

A CITIZEN.

## L E T T E R IV.

MR. EDITOR,

**I**N reading Mr. Scott's preface to his letters, I was a good deal struck, by the account he has given of Mr. Burke's moving for papers of so old a date as 1776, to be laid before the House of Commons, with a view of making the world suppose that Mr. Hastings had about that time been guilty of some act of delinquency, or at least that a discovery of former misdeeds had then been made. We all of us know, Mr. Editor, how sturdily Mr. Burke stood up in the House of Commons, in defence of two men, whom four great lawyers had thought proper objects of a public prosecution, and whom the late ministry had solemnly dismissed from their offices. The reasons assigned by Mr. Burke, for restoring them to their stations were "because delinquency had not been proved against



gainst them," and "that it would be hard to punish men unconvicted of any crimes."— Now, Mr. Editor, it was natural for me to enquire particularly what grounds Mr. Burke had for supposing Mr. Hastings to be a delinquent, nay, for asserting that he was one? Either these grounds must be very strong, I said to myself, or Mr. Burke must be a very bad man—for in one instance he restores men to responsible offices, against whom there were the strongest suspicions of mal practices, and in another case, he positively pronounces a Gentleman in high office, a notorious delinquent, previous to his even calling for the proofs. Indeed, Mr. Editor, the proofs ought to be very strong to justify Mr. Burke, in using such language. Mr. Scott has already detected the false statement of the opinion of the several lawyers who were consulted, and he has proved from their own words, that instead of advising a prosecution, as the Ninth Report states, they actually did the very reverse. In looking over the appendix, I was much struck with the opinion of John Smith of Drapers Hall, the Company's Solicitor, a shrewd, sensible, long-headed man; and if he, Mr. Editor, gave such an opinion in 1776,

as I now copy from the Appendix to the Ninth Report, No. 111, A. what, I ask you, and through your means I desire to ask Mr. Burke, can any Member of Parliament make of these charges in the Autumn or Winter of 1783?

“ Upon the whole of this evidence, I cannot bring myself to think, that there is sufficient ground for the Company to commence a suit against Mr. Hastings, for recovery of those sums to which my observations are confined; I mean all the sums stated, except the lack and an half upon which the opinion of counsel has been taken. The proof is exceedingly confused; but when I consider the eagerness the majority of the council have shewn to establish those charges; *the extraordinary measures they pursued for the purpose; the very easy mode of proving the facts if true; the very slender proof (if any) that is given, the observation arising upon the face of the proof, and the flat contradiction of Muny Begum; these various circumstances, on my mind, amount almost to an absolute conviction, that the story*

“ cannot

" cannot be true. If the fact had been true,  
 " the persons mentioned by Nundcomar, as  
 " those through whose hands the first four  
 " articles were paid, might have been ex-  
 " amined, and they must have proved the  
 " facts; but it does not appear, that any one  
 " of them was called upon, although most  
 " of them were resident in Calcutta. This  
 " proof would have been easy and certain;  
 " if any thing had been given for procuring  
 " the Naibship for Goordas, he must have  
 " known it; but he was not asked a question  
 " upon that subject: The only witnesses  
 " that attempt any proof are Nundcomar,  
 " and his son-in-law Goordas. As to Nund-  
 " comar, if his bad character was not too  
 " well established, not to deserve credit, the  
 " manner in which he tells this story would  
 " destroy his credit. In the outset, he avows  
 " making those charges against Mr. Hastings,  
 " only because he feared complaints would  
 " be made against himself, and because he  
 " was angry at Mr. Hastings shewing disre-  
 " spect to him, and favour to others. He  
 " states the money all to have been paid  
 " in August, September, October, and No-  
 " vember 1772; but the letter produced by  
 " him



him, in confirmation of this story, is not  
 pretended to be received till 1773, long  
 after the payments are pretended to be  
 made; yet the letter imports the request of  
 a loan, to make a payment of One Hundred  
 Thousand Rupees. If Nundcomar had  
 either paid or engaged to pay such large  
 sums for Muny Begum, no doubt in the  
 letter, he is supposed to have written to her,  
 he would have informed her of it. I can-  
 not help thinking that this letter was forg-  
 ed.

Here, Mr. Editor, I have given you John  
 Smith's opinion. The sentiments of the  
 counsellors were equally honorable for Mr.  
 Hastings. The matter dropped; yet at this  
 distance of time, Mr. Burke revives it. In-  
 deed, indeed, Mr. Editor, these are shame-  
 ful proceedings. Is this to be one of the  
 blessed effects of the coalition, that Lord  
 North shall assist Mr. Burke in the perfec-  
 tion of so great a character as Mr. Hastings?  
 I cannot think so favorably of Lord North's  
 conduct as Mr. Scott does; but I venture to  
 prophecy, Mr. Editor, that Edmund Burke  
 will be as unsuccessful in attacking the cha-  
 racter

rafter and honest fame of Mr. Hastings, as he was in defending the men whom he restored some time ago to their offices.

When I see such scandalous doings going forward, I cannot forbear speaking out. If I go to 'Change, to the London Tavern, or the Queen's Arms, I meet nothing but long faces: that we are a ruined nation all men agree, and if Lord North, by his measures, has not brought us to this sad pass, Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke, by their opposition, have done it. Who would have thought, Mr. Editor, that after such bitter enmity, these men could have joined, for no other purpose than to share amongst themselves, and their dependants, the little that is left! Here we see Lord North with places for himself, his sons, cousins, and others, to a great amount. Then again we behold Mr. Burke with places of old standing, or newly created, in the possession of himself, his son, brother, and cousins, to the enormous amount, as I have seen in print, of 25,500l. a year. Then again Mr. Fox with his connections at the Treasury, Admiralty, &c.—Thus dividing the patronage of England amongst them, and not con-

D

tent

tented with that, we have seen Mr. Burke attacking in a shameful manner, (as every man in the city allows, even the few friends that are left to Edmund Burke allow it) a man; who amidst all the struggle for places and power in this abandoned country, has proceeded in a spirited and honorable discharge of his duty, and has had the glory to save India before he knew of the peace in Europe: That Mr. Burke from interest, passion, envy, and disappointment, should behave as he has done, it is not to be wondered at; but that Lord North should act the part of Noll Bluff to this Sir Joseph, is indeed most extraordinary!

A CITIZEN.

*Broad-street, 6th August 1783.*

LETTER



## L E T T E R V.

MR. EDITOR,

I Dined yesterday with a friend in Surry, who has a seat in parliament, and in his parlour window lay the 10th report of the Select Committee. "What the duce!" exclaimed I—"another report from that industrious, *impartial*, and indefatigable body!"—"Yes," replied the Member, "and a very severe one too."—"I think quite the contrary," said my friend, the Proprietor, who was present: "I have read it with attention, but can find nothing in it to the disadvantage of Mr. Hastings: it will doubtless be completely answered; but as I have some little knowledge of India matters, picked up by a constant attendance at General Courts, reading all India pamphlets, and having, for a Bengal

cor-

correspondent, a very intelligent young man, my nephew William; I could not read the Tenth Report without putting the reflections, that occurred at the time, upon paper, and they are at the service of my friend the Citizen, if he chuses to make them the subject of his two next letters."——To be sure, Mr. Editor, I readily accepted his offer, and I hope the following account will be as acceptable to your numerous readers, as, I confess to you, it was to me.

\* Mr. Hastings has said, and the truth  
 \* of the observation will strike every man who  
 \* attentively reads the Tenth Report, That  
 \* there is no proposition which the wit of  
 \* man can devise, which the wit of man can-  
 \* not find plausible, and perhaps even just  
 \* cause of censure, by a false and partial re-  
 \* view of it; and I, of all men, may be al-  
 \* lowed to dread this treatment, after having  
 \* invariably experienced it in every instance  
 \* of my public life.

The Tenth Report is in fact the speech  
 made by General Richard Smith, at a Court  
 of Proprietors, on the 24th of October last,  
 enlarged

enlarged and improved. I remember the General told us then, that though we would not hear him, he would take care to be heard in another place; and I was present when he made his complaint in Parliament, that he was interrupted by clamour by the Proprietors, though unluckily he forgot to state that he was heard for upwards of an hour with great attention; it is true, the Court would not patiently attend to a second Philippic from him, on the same day. The Report states what the General then said, that Mr. Hastings went up to Benares, with a view of getting fifty lacks of rupees, for the Company, from Cheyt Sing; but being disappointed, he persuaded the Vizier to seize the treasures of his mother, for the Company's service, under the pretence of his having levied troops for Cheyt Sing at the time of his revolt, through her eunuchs, Jewar Ally Cawn, and Behar Ally Cawn. The General ludicrously compared these men, and their efforts, to Pachierotti and Tenducci, exciting a revolt in London — This is the outline of General Richard Smith's speech on that day of triumph for Mr. Hastings, and it is the outline of the Tenth Report too. In the  
Re.



Report, as in the speech, there are many artful appeals to the passions and prejudices of the moment; but the suspected compiler of it has at last talked himself out of all credit. Indeed his professions and his actions are proved to have been so far at variance, that men will, in future, examine for themselves, and not take for matter of fact, the sublime rapsodies of the person who protected two public defaulters, and prosecuted Lord Rodney and Mr. Hastings;—who from being the calumniator, is become the panygerist of Lord North,—and who earnestly recommending œconomy when out of place, was the person to solicit the establishment of a sinecure office, when in place, for the emolument of a near relation. The people of England having, by sad misfortune, recovered their sober senses, and seeing how miserably they were disappointed when they trusted to the flowery professions of Mr. Burke;——perhaps the following plain narration of authentic facts may now be opposed, with success, to the splendid misrepresentations contained in the Tenth Report. I find, by my nephew William's letters, that the late Vizier died in the month of  
January,

January, 1775, and that he was supposed to leave behind him above two million sterling, in specie and jewels, besides other valuable effects. — These, as is the custom of the East, were lodged for security in the Zenana, or womens apartments; and by that means fell into the hands of the Begum, the wife of the Vizier. When Affolph ul Dowlah succeeded his father, he found a large army greatly in arrears, clamorous, and mutinous for want of pay, and he himself deprived of his father's treasures, which of right belonged to him, was unable to satisfy their just demands. The presence of the English army saved his life more than once. — Frequent applications were made to the old woman, the mother of Affolph ul Dowlah, for his father's treasures, but without success. In October, 1775, Mr. John Bristow went to Fyzabad, and he writes to the Supreme Council, Appendix, No. 1, " that in explaining  
 " particularly to the Begum, in writing,  
 " how impossible it was for the Nabob to  
 " conduct his government without further  
 " assistance. I further insinuated to her, that  
 " the treasures she possessed, were the *treas-*  
*ures of the State*, as she had not succeeded  
 " to

“ to them by any *legal right*, and that they  
 “ had been hoarded up to provide *against an*  
 “ *emergency.*”

After some negotiation, the old woman consented to pay thirty lacks of rupees, on condition Mr. Bristow would engage, on the part of the Company, that no further demands should be made upon her.—This he was obliged to consent to, without waiting for instructions from the Supreme Council; and they approved the measure, since it was absolutely necessary.—There were several disputes between the Begum's Eunuchs and the Vizier's Minister, relative to the nature of the effects which were paid in part of the thirty lacks; and the Begum herself wrote a very violent letter to Mr. Hastings, on part of which Mr. Francis makes the following observation, “ I cannot conceive she (the Begum) has the least right to interfere in the Nabob's government. In a country where women are not allowed a free agency, in the most trifling domestic affairs, it seems extraordinary that this lady should presume to talk of appointing Ministers, and governing kingdoms. Upon the whole, I  
 “ look



“ look upon the letter as not of her writing,  
 “ who probably cannot read, but as the com-  
 “ position of some of her servants; perhaps  
 “ of the *Eunuch* who brings it.”

The Begum's complaints were sent to Mr. Bristow, and his observations upon them will perhaps throw as much light upon the real character of the Begum, and her Eunuchs, as the committee's reflections on Lieutenant Colonel Harpur's evidence, who quitted Bengal ten years ago, and before the death of Sujah Dowlah, which event made the Eunuchs of consequence in Oude.

Mr. Bristow says, “ In making this com-  
 “ plaint, the Begum forgets the improper  
 “ conduct of her own servants, who have hi-  
 “ therto preserved a *total independence of the*  
 “ *Nabob's authority*, beat the officers of his go-  
 “ vernment, and *refused obedience to his Pere-*  
 “ *wannabs*.—The Begum's Eunuchs did  
 “ industriously spread reports of Murteza  
 “ Cawn's ill intentions, to break into the  
 “ Zenana, and seize all the effects and money  
 “ that could be found,—The Begum had  
 “ great interest in the late Vizier's time.

E

“ On

" On the Nabob's accession, he at once placed  
 " the sole management in the hands of Mur-  
 " teza Cawn, which disgusted both her and  
 " her adherents, *particularly their Eunuuchs,*  
 " *who have their views in keeping the wealth in*  
 " *the Begum's possession.* The principal, Bahar  
 " Ally Cawn *enjoys her entire confidence.*" Mr.  
 Bristow sends the Supreme Council, with these  
 remarks, a letter from the Begum to him,  
 which concludes thus, " Cause the 56 lacks  
 " to be restored to me; do not you then take  
 " any part in the affair, and then let Affolphi  
 " ul Dowla, and Murteza Cawn, in *whatever*  
 " *manner they are able, take sums of money from*  
 " *me. They will then see the consequences.*"

You shall have the remainder of my  
 friend's remarks, Mr. Editor, in another  
 letter.

Broad-street,

Aug. 16, 1783.

A CITIZEN.

## LETTER VI.

Mr. Editor,

**I** Now send you the remainder of my friend the Proprietor's account.

"The agreement between the Vizier and his mother, to which Mr. Bristow, on the part of the Company, was guarantee, was executed on the 15th of October, 1775, but it was not until the 7th of July, 1776, that she paid the balance, or gave assignments, and then the Vizier was obliged to submit to a considerable deduction from the sum specified in the original treaty. And Mr. Bristow observed to the supreme Council, "the Begum can make no great claim on the Company for protection, *when she herself has infringed the conditions of the treaty, of which they were the guarantees.*" In the same letter,



ter, dated 3d of January, 1776, Mr. Bristow says, "How far she (the Begum) may be  
 "better affected to the English than the Na-  
 "bob, I leave to the consideration of the  
 "Honorable Board, from the following fact,  
 "On the conclusion of the treaty between  
 "the Company and the Nabob, the Begum  
 "blamed his Excellency very highly, and  
 "insisted on his not ceding Benares, offering  
 "*of herself* a sum of money in lieu of it."—  
 Mr. Bristow writes to the Begum in reply to  
 a letter of complaint from her. "With re-  
 "spect to your Highness jaghiers, the Nabob  
 "agrees to one method, which is, that you  
 "give them up entirely, and instead thereof  
 "receive a monthly stipend, through the  
 "channel of any person you choose to fix on;  
 "for the Nabob observed to me, *that two*  
 "*rulers were too much for one country.* By  
 "this proposal, the Nabob is desirous of pro-  
 "moting your Highness' quiet, tranquillity,  
 "and satisfaction. The Nabob says that in  
 "this case you will have no vexation, and  
 "will constantly receive your stipend with-  
 "out trouble."

This

This extract proves that the idea of resuming the Begum's jaghier was entertained as early as 1776 by the Vizier, and not, as is insinuated in the report, mentioned to him for the first time in 1781, by Mr. Hastings.

The Vizier however could not procure his mother's consent, to accept an annual sum in lieu of her jaghier, and her Eunuchs were in possession of very great power and influence, till the time of Cheyt Sing's revolt. Her activity in his behalf, is proved beyond the possibility of a doubt—Her disaffection, and the intrigues of her Eunuchs were equally well proved. Was not Mr. Hastings, under such circumstances, strictly justifiable in withdrawing our guarantee, and by that means enabling the Vizier to possess himself of those treasures which were his undoubted right, and which were to be applied to the pressing exigencies of the East-India Company? However pathetically Mr. Edmund Burke may talk of these matters, his pretended humanity will no longer deceive in the City; and my nephew, William, assured me in one of his last letters, that we owe the preservation

tion of India, to the considerable sum of seven hundred thousand pounds, which we received from the Vizier in February 1782; that he could not have paid this money, except from the hoarded treasures of his deceased father, and those ought to have been in his possession many years ago, since the Begum, had not the smallest right to retain them.—This is the true state of a transaction, which the ingenuity of the compiler of the tenth report, has turned and twisted so as to bewilder a man of common understanding. An old lady immured by custom in a seraglio for life, was permitted by us, to retain a large treasure, the property of her son; she employs this money, and her extensive influence, in opposition to the British government—She is compelled in consequence to relinquish the treasure—no further violence is offered, nor are her Eunuchs ill treated, though well deserving an exemplary punishment. Least the term Eunuch should inspire my worthy fellow citizens with the idea of a poor, miserable, squeaking, Italian ballad singer, I will copy an account of a disturbance excited by an Eunuch in Oude,



as it was sent to me by my nephew William, in 1776.

Cojee Bussaun, a *complete Eunuch*, was the favorite general of Sujah Dowlah, and very well known to General Smith and Sir Robert Barker. His influence at the court of Oude was considerably lessened by the death of Sujah Dowlah, though he was continued by his successor at the head of a large body of his forces. He was jealous of Murteza Cawn, the favorite minister of Affolph ul Dowlah, and was supposed to have entered into engagements with Saudut Ally and the Begum, for the deposition of the Nabob, and the destruction of his minister. In December, 1775, Cojee Bussaun, according to a pre-concerted plan, invited the minister, Murteza Cawn, to an entertainment with several of his principal friends. The Company drank hard, the dancing girls were called in, and, after a little time, Murteza Cawn, the prime minister, was carried in a state of intoxication into another room, and there inhumanly murdered.—After perpetrating this shocking act, Cojee Bussaun, with his sword drawn, rushed into the presence of the Vizier, and was advancing

vancing towards his person, either to seize him, or to put him to death.—Bussaun had drank hard himself, and betrayed such strong marks of confusion in his countenance, that the Vizier with great presence of mind called out “Will no one rid me of this traitor?”—twenty swords were drawn, and in an instant Cojee Bussaun was cut to pieces. Saudut Ally fled with a few of his confidential attendants, nor were the parties concerned in the plot ever discovered; so far is clear, Muteza Cawn, the Vizier’s prime minister was murdered by the Eunuch, Cojee Bussaun, who was himself put to death by the Vizier’s attendants.—I relate this fact to prove that Eunuchs in India are bold, intriguing, and enterprising men, nor was it right in General Smith to attempt to mislead us, by comparing them to Pachioretti and Tenducci; he knew better, though some of us perhaps did not.

In the tenth report there are some remarks upon a transaction, which I thought could not be related to the discredit of Mr. Hastings. He received a present of ten lacks of rupees from the Vizier and his ministers, and told

told the Company of it. He received other presents, to the amount of nine lacks more, making in all one hundred and ninety thousand pounds sterling. This large sum he has paid into the Company's treasury. He does not even touch a farthing of the interest of it, instead of retaining the principal, which would have enabled him to vye with the gamblers at Brooks's, to be ranked as a companion for princes of the blood royal of France, and to have procured himself and a few of his friends, seats in a certain assembly, at the *next general election*, by bribery. The compiler of the tenth report has had wit and ingenuity enough to find out that "when these facts become known in India, it is to be feared that the servants of the Company will be inclined to lessen their reverence and respect to those acts of parliament which were made to restrain them in pursuit of wealth; and that they will be apt to reconcile to their own minds, any deviation from a strict obedience, by quoting the example of the Governor-General, as a rule by which they may guide their own conduct."



I conceive it impossible that a transaction so honorable to Mr. Hastings in every point of view, can operate to the disadvantage of the state, unless indeed, the servants of the Company seeing that a man who has served faithfully and honestly for above three and thirty years, and when he has every reason to believe his service is drawing towards a close, candidly declares that he has received presents to the amount of one hundred and ninety thousand pounds, and accounts to the public treasury for every shilling of the principal and interest; if such a man, instead of receiving from his constituents a part of this sum, a life interest in a part of it, or even the most trifling mark of approbation, shall have the mortification to be abused for so singular an act of disinterestedness and integrity; if this transaction shall be misrepresented without doors, and be the subject of a parliamentary Report; if that Report shall be presented to the House of Commons by a man who served in Bengal four years and seven months only, in a station inferior to Mr. Hastings, but who was permitted by the Court of Directors to retain a present to the amount of thirty-six thousand

thousand pounds, although he actually made the Company pay for all the presents he made in his public character, to the amount of above sixteen thousand pounds, and retained in his own hands those he received in return; if, I say, the servants of the Company observe, how unequally rewards, and commendations are conferred upon different men, as the spirit of party, rather than that of justice prevails; then, and then only, can this honorable act of the Governor-General operate to the disadvantage of the state, by inducing the Company's servants in India to believe, that no rectitude of conduct can screen them from the malignant invectives of party malice, patriotic spleen, and interested misrepresentation."

These, Mr. Editor, are my friend's remarks, I will give you my homely sentiments in another Letter.

*Broad-street, August 11, 1783.*

**A CITIZEN.**

## L E T T E R VII.

Mr. EDITOR,

**M**Y good friend and neighbour, the Proprietor, called upon me last night, with some further remarks upon the Tenth Report, which I now transcribe, not doubting but that you and your Readers will be amused and instructed by them.

“ I cannot help noticing a very curious assertion contained in the Tenth Report: “ That the decision of the Court of Directors, as to the ten lacks of Rupees given by the Vizier and his Minister to Mr. Hastings was very unjust.” It appears to me that these five or six *virtuous* Reporters (not possessing among them a shilling of property in India-stock) would persuade the Court of Directors to return this money, because they represent the Vizier to be a vassal of the Company’s



pany's. Surely neither the Chairman, Sir Henry Fletcher, nor any of the Directors, will permit one or two men behind the curtain to manage the affairs of the East-India Company. If any person should propose, either in a Court of Directors, or in a Committee of Correspondence, to send orders to the Governor-General and Council, to pay back these ten lacks of Rupees to the Vizier, we should be at no loss to guess from what quarter that person, bringing forward such a proposition, was advised and directed; but should a single Director adopt the ideas of the Select Committee, after having given orders several months ago upon the subject, which were highly proper (because they do not preclude the East-India Company from rewarding hereafter the important services of Mr. Hastings) I hope there will be firmness enough in a majority of the Directors to resist the proposition. If we are to adopt this wild idea of Mr. Burke, let us act consistently. That gentleman's humanity is so subservient to his party views, that from him partial justice only can be expected: but let me ask General Richard Smith, if the Emperor Shaw Allum, the King of the world,

was

was not a vassal of the Company, and as poor as any king upon earth, when the General accepted presents from him? Why not require the General to return them all? I believe the cash would be very acceptable to his Majesty, for my nephew William, writes me, that from the time he quitted the English, he has suffered the greatest distress. Why not order the Company to pay his arrears of tribute, for we have some patriots amongst us, who say we had no right to withhold it? Why not pay back to the poor distressed unhappy Nabob of Arcot, some of the money that the Company has taken from him? and why not call upon many English gentlemen to refund the presents they have received from him? Let us, for God's sake, be amused with no more of these rapsodies; Mr. Hastings is not a man to make use of unfair means to procure presents to himself; he has too much spirit, and too great a disregard for money to obtain it by improper means; if the Company thinks proper to retain every shilling of the money received, amounting to 190,000*l.* for their own use, let them do it; they have a right to it; but let not the ingenuity of Edmund Burke persuade

suade the Chairman or any other Director of  
 his party, that we shall be disgraced, if we  
 do not pay to the Vizier and his Minister, the  
 ten lacks of Rupees which they gave to Mr.  
 Hastings in September, 1781. I believe there  
 is not a more distressed Prince in India, than  
 the Raja of Tanjore; why not call upon the  
 family of the Burkes to refund all that they  
 have received from him? and, to complete  
 with equity, this system of reformation, let  
 us send transports from this country, let us  
 embark every Englishman in India, and let  
 us in future appear there in the character of  
 traders only. If we are not already sick of  
 the Utopian schemes of Edmund Burke, let  
 us give the world a sure proof of our moder-  
 ation. Having lost America, let us abandon  
 India. I remember the time when General  
 Richard Smith possessed a very large pro-  
 perty in India-stock, and when he wished to  
 be thought the protector of the rights of the  
 East-India Company. He has now sold out  
 even his single vote, has declared we are not  
 solvent, and has exerted himself by every  
 possible means in his power, both in and out  
 of Parliament, to remove Mr. Hastings.—

Surely



Surely, neither Mr. Fox, or any other Minister will think of desiring the Directors to employ a person in future, who has been so hostile to us."

Here, Mr. Editor, I have given you my friend's account at length.—I am a blunt citizen, but in my opinion it is very curious that the Select Committee should fix upon Mr. Hastings's presents as the only ones that ought to be returned. To be sure, Mr. Editor, it is very generous of Mr. Burke and General Smith, to dispose of other people's money as they do, I wish I could see them give up a little of their own with all my heart: a plain man like me must wonder how this money business can be a proper object of enquiry for a Committee instructed to *enquire into the state of the judicature in Bengal, and how the British possessions in India may be best governed.*"——The Court of Proprietors are much obliged to these gentlemen for their laudable zeal, and I hope, in return, they will appoint William Burke, Esq; the Tanjore agent, a Supreme Counsellor; and General Smith, to the government of Bombay.

As you may not hear from me again for a month or two, Mr. Editor, I cannot avoid copying, for the edification of your readers, a few lines from a very extraordinary book just published, entitled, *The Life of Mr. Fox*,—  
 “ But the public was peculiarly charmed and  
 “ struck with admiration, by the generous  
 “ and disinterested patriotism of Mr. Burke,  
 “ &c. &c. &c.”—I will not surfeit you by a longer extract, but I wish to know if Edmund Burke’s coalition with Lord North, and securing to himself and his family 25,500l. a year, are proofs either of disinterestedness or patriotism?—If by the Public, the writer means the Citizens of London, or the People of England, I believe, Mr. Editor, they deem all Patriots in the Ministry, men of words and not of deeds, having been so grossly duped and deceived by the very best of them.

Broad-street,

Aug. 18, 1783.

A CITIZEN.